

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

### Claims

Claims 1-22 are pending. Claims 1, 11 and 21 are independent.

### Claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-9 and 11-22 as being anticipated by German patent document DE 10134830A1 to Christal. Applicant respectfully disagrees for at least the following reasons.

Christal discloses a holder for holding a mobile telephone and a headset used with the mobile telephone. A first embodiment of the holder is shown in Fig. 1A, at reference numeral 4. A second embodiment is shown in Fig. 2B, at reference numeral 5. Each embodiment of the holder includes an electrical coupler for electrically coupling electrical inputs of the mobile telephone to electrical inputs of the headset. In the first embodiment, the electrical coupler is shown in Fig. 1D at reference numeral 1, and in the second embodiment, the electrical coupler is shown in Fig. 2C, at reference numeral 19. The electrical coupler (1, 19) is for enabling recharging of the mobile telephone and of the headset by a single battery charger. A battery charger plug (16) connectable to the electrical coupler (1) is shown in Fig. 1D.

### Claims 1 and 11

Independent claims 1 and 11, each to a holster, recite, *inter alia*,

*a mating structure for releasably retaining the peripheral device in direct electrical contact with the mobile device when retained in the sleeve so as to permit the mobile device to charge a battery in the peripheral device.*

This is in sharp contrast with the mating structure (electrical coupler) of Christal, which is for allowing simultaneous recharging of a mobile telephone and a headset with a single external charger, not for recharging the headset with the mobile device. As is known by mobile telephone users, electrical inputs of mobile telephones are exposed. It would be unsafe to a user if these electrical inputs allowed electricity to flow from the mobile telephone battery to an output connected to the electrical inputs. If this were the case, a mobile telephone placed in a

user's pocket with loose change could discharge itself, putting the user at risk of electrical shock and burns, not to mention the risk of damage to the battery. Thus, electrically interconnecting the electrical inputs of the headset (3) and of the mobile telephone (2) of Christal with the electrical coupler (1, 19) cannot cause electrical charge to flow from one to the other, as this would be contrary to any safety standards. Rather, the electrical coupler (1, 19) is provided to permit simultaneous recharging of the headset (3) and of the mobile telephone (2) with a single charger. Further, the headset (3) and the mobile telephone (2) of Christal are connected by an electrical coupler (1, 19), they are not in direct electrical contact as recited in claim 1.

#### Independent claim 21

Claim 21 is to a peripheral device including, *inter alia*,

*a charging contact for providing a charge to the battery when placed in  
direct electrical contact with a charging port of a mobile device.*

The charging port of claim 21 is in sharp contrast Christal: the mobile device (2) of Christal has input electrical contacts for receiving an electrical recharge signal from a charger through an electrical coupler (1, 19), not for providing a charge to a battery of a peripheral device as claimed in claim 21. Christal simply fails to teach or fairly suggest any type of charging port of a mobile device used for recharging a peripheral device. Further, the headset (3) and the mobile telephone (2) of Christal are connected by an electrical coupler (1, 19), they are not provided with a charging contact and a charging port in direct electrical contact as recited in claim 21.

Such a charging port is shown, for example, in Figs. 5A and 5B, at reference numeral 32, and is discussed in the application as filed, at least at paragraphs 0017-0019, 0023, 0024, and 0026-0026. The meaning of the expression "a charging port" is thus clearly related to providing an electrical recharge signal from a mobile device to a peripheral device, as is apparent from the specification and drawings as originally filed. Therefore, Applicant submits that the expression "a charging port" is clearly defined and supported, and in accordance with MPEP §2173.05(a).

Therefore, Applicant submits that Christal fails to teach or fairly suggest all the elements of independent claims 1, 11 and 21. Withdrawal of the rejection to independent claims 1, 11 and 21, and to their respective dependent claims 2-8, 12-20, and 22, as being anticipated by Christal under 35 U.S.C. §102(a), is respectfully requested.

Claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claim 10 as being obvious in view of Christal and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0116161A1 to Grivas. Claim 10 depends from claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees for at least the following reasons.

Applicant reiterates the comments made above in respect of Christal, and submits that the combination of Christal and Grivas fails to teach all the elements of claim 10.

Grivas discloses a method for reducing peak current levels in a communication unit. As an example of how the method can be used, Grivas shows and discusses, in Fig. 1 and paragraph 0012 respectively, a mobile telephone (103) powering an accessory (111), the accessory being a camera.

Applicant submits that, as in Christal, Grivas fails to teach or fairly suggest any type of holder comprising, *inter alia*,

*a mating structure for releasably retaining the peripheral device in direct electrical contact with the mobile device when retained in the sleeve so as to permit the mobile device to charge a battery in the peripheral device*

as recited in claim 1. The mobile telephone (103) and accessory (111) of Grivas are not in direct electrical contact. Rather, they are connected by what appears to be a cable (Fig. 1). Further, Grivas discloses that the mobile telephone (103) powers the accessory (111), not that it recharges the accessory.

Since both Christal and Grivas fail to teach or fairly suggest all the claim limitations of claim 1, they cannot teach or fairly suggest all the limitations of a claim depending from claim 1. Therefore, there is no showing of prima facie obviousness. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

No fee is believed due for this submission. However, Applicant authorizes the Commissioner to debit any required fee from Deposit Account No. 501593. The Commissioner is further authorized to debit an additional amount required, and to credit any overpayment to the above noted deposit account.

It is submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance, and action to that end is respectfully requested.

**Respectfully submitted,**

**LOWLES, Robert J.**

By: /L. Anne Kinsman/  
**L. Anne Kinsman**  
**Reg. No. 45,291**

Borden Ladner Gervais LLP  
World Exchange Plaza  
100 Queen Street, Suite 1100  
Ottawa, ON K1P 1J9  
CANADA  
Tel: (613) 787-3519  
Fax: (613) 787-3558  
E-mail: akinsman@blgcanada.com

ALK/LBA/plg